



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,944	06/04/2001	Ian Copeman	2657.2012-001	3399

21005 7590 10/17/2007
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/873,944	Applicant(s) COPEMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Son P. Huynh	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/17/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With response to Applicant's argument Zigmond does not and cannot teach Applicant's transmission schedule sent in advance of the promotion(s), because Zigmond selects an ad for display from ads already received (bridge paragraph on pages 8-9), the Examiner respectfully traverses.

The claim recites the transmission schedule is sent in advance of the one or more promotions being received by the individual network device. However, the claim

does not recite the promotion (or any portion) of the promotions is not stored at the network device. Zigmond discloses the ad selection rules, ad parameters, trigger, etc. can be delivered to the ad insertion device by any available channel independent from the delivery of the advertisement stream and the video programming feed (see include, but are not limited to, col. 12, lines 1-14). Thus, even the ad already received, the transmission schedule (e.g., ad selection rules, ad parameters, triggers, etc.) could be sent in advance of one or more promotions being received by the individual network device. In fact, Zigmond discloses the ad selection rules, ad parameters, trigger are used for ad selection (see include, but are not limited to, figures 2, 5-6). Zigmond also discloses the advertisement can be delivered to the ad insertion device from the local repository or from repository at the central location (col. 8, lines 1-11). In addition, Zigmond discloses in response to ad selection using ad parameter, ad selection rules, ad selection scheduled with trigger, etc., the advertisements are delivered to the ad insertion device, selected, and displayed "on the fly" without any actual intermediate storage of the advertisements in the ad insertion device. This method of "streaming" advertisement data is useful in home entertainment systems having small or no hard drive or other data storage device (see include, but are not limited to, col. 15, line 45-col. 16, line 20). Thus, the transmission schedule (e.g., event triggers, ad selection rules, ad parameters, etc.) must be sent in advance of the one or more promotions being received by the individual network device (e.g., sensitive advertisement, or "streaming" advertisement data, ad that is sent "on the fly" so that the transmission schedule of the ad is identified before the ad is selected and transmitted.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Zigmond and Schlack fail to teach, "transmission schedule specifies when an individual network device is to receive one or more promotions (page 10, paragraph 6, page 11, paragraph 3), the Examiner respectfully traverses.

Zigmond discloses the event trigger, ad selection rules, ad parameter, etc. are used to determine when the ad are received from the advertisement sources (e.g., ad is received according to local time, network, program being display, etc., or triggering signal triggers the ad to be received at ad insertion device "on the fly", etc. (see include, but are not limited to, figures 2,4-6, col. 10, line 48-col. 13, line 6, col. 13, line 60-col. 14, line 56, col. 15, line 35-col. 16, line 20). Thus, Zigmond discloses the transmission schedule specifies when an individual network device is to receive one or more promotions (interpreted as event trigger, ad selection rule, ad parameter, etc., specifies when to a household device including ad insertion device is to receive one or more advertisement based on local time, network connection, household demographics, program being displayed, etc.).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no motivation/suggestion to combine the references because the teachings of each reference actually conflict with one another. Zigmond teaches first selecting an ad from a plurality of received ads, and then inserting the selected ad into a program feed to display the selected ad to a viewer.

Art Unit: 2623

Schlack, on the other hand, teaches first inserting an ad...(page 11, paragraph 4), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is found in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In specifically, both reference are directed to the same field of endeavor (i.e., target advertisements). The examiner further recognizes the teaching of each reference does not actually conflict with one another. Zigmond discloses the ad is selected and then inserted into the program (see include, but are not limited to, col. 8, lines 1-11, col. 14, lines 1-24, col. 15, line 50- col. 16, line 19). Schlack also discloses the ad is selected and then inserted into the program (see include, but are not limited to, col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 21).

Therefore, the combination of the references is proper.

For the reason given above, rejections on claims 1-50 are analyzed as discussed below.

Claim 8 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-34, 36-42, 44-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond et al. (US 6,698,020 B1) in view of Schlack (US 7,185,353).

Regarding claim 1, Zigmond discloses a system for targeting promotions (advertisements, pay per view, subscription, special-interest television services, or the like) to an individual network device (device at household— see include, but are not limited to, figures 3-5, 7-8, col. 6, lines 3-47), comprising:

a scheduler which generates a transmission schedule for transmission of promotion to an individual network device, wherein the transmission specifies when the individual network device is to receive the one or more promotions, and is sent by the scheduler to the individual network device in advance of the one or more promotions being received by the individual network device (video programming content provider including advertisement source, program source, ad trigger source, etc. generates event triggers, ad selection rules, advertisement parameters and provides them to the device at the household for use to select promotion such as advertisements at

appropriate time for transmission and displayed to the user, the event trigger, ad selection rules, advertisement parameters, etc. is sent from the ad source in advance of the advertisement content— see include, but are not limited to, figures 1, 5, 7,8, col. 7, line 55-col. 9, line 52, col. 11, line 35-col. 12, line 43, col. 15, line 45-col. 16, line 19 and discussed in the Response to Argument above);

a promotion agent subsystem, located at the individual network device that receives the transmission schedule from the scheduler, wherein the promotion agent processes the transmission schedule to receive the one or more promotions (e.g., the video switching in the device at household that receives trigger signal, ad selection rules, or ad parameters from the video programming content provider, the video switch processes the trigger signal, ad selection rules, etc. to receives selected advertisements – see include, but are not limited to, figure 5, col. 4, lines 35-52, col. 15, lines 35-65).

Zigmond also discloses collecting viewership profile generated from viewer usage data collected from the individual network device (i.e., viewer response to the selected advertisements, viewer's viewing habits, etc.) and a membership criteria which describes a particular demographic (i.e., age, sex, income, etc.), or geographic location (i.e., regional location, city, neighborhood or street address, etc.) and provided these collected information to advertiser, video programming content providers, third party operator for use to target promotion/advertisements to the particular device at the household (see include, but are not limited to, col. 10, line 35-col. 12, line 43, col. 13, line 59-col. 58, col. 17, lines 33-49, col. 19, lines 24-33). Zigmond also discloses components of ad insertion device may be located at a remote location (col. 7, lines 50-

67. However, Zigmond does not explicitly disclose the transmission schedule for transmission the promotion is generated by matching i) a viewership profile generated from viewer usage data collected from the individual network device with ii) a membership criteria which describes a particular demographic, viewership history, or geographic location.

Schlack discloses transmission schedule for transmission of promotion is generated for individual network device by matching i) a viewership profile generated from viewer usage data collected from the individual network device with ii) a membership criteria which describes a particular demographic, viewership history, or geographic location (in scheduling the ads, the ad scheduler 44 relies on market segment information, ad/avail information, subscriber information, and channel change information, wherein the subscriber information may identifying all or groups of subscribers on the network and their demographics or other characteristics (is read on membership criteria), and channel change statistics identify an average channel change frequency for subscriber/viewer... (is read on "a viewership profile generated from viewer usage data collected from the individual network device") – see include, but are not limited to, col. 5, line 63-col. 7, line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zigmond to incorporate the teaching as taught by Schlack in order to improve bandwidth utilization for transmission schedule.

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claim 2, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the system comprising a bulk manger server (e.g. ad source, or third party advertisement provider, etc. see include, but are not limited to, col. 14, line 66-col. 15, line 16, figures 3-4).

Regarding claim 3, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 2. Zigmond further discloses bulk manager server stores promotions to be scheduled for display on the network device (see include, but are not limited to, col. 8, lines 1-12, col. 14, line 66-col. 15, line 16, figures 3-4).

Regarding claim 4, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 2. Zigmond further discloses the bulk manager server downloads the promotions to the bulk manager agent (see include, but are not limited to, col. 14, line 66-col. 15, line 16).

Regarding claim 5, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 4. Zigmond further discloses the scheduler sends schedule information to the promotion agent which processes the schedule information and transmits the processed scheduled information to the bulk manger agent (video programming content provider sends schedule information such as trigger event, ad selection criteria, etc. to video switch in the network device at the household, which detects trigger event, information in ad selection criteria, and transmits the processed

scheduled information to the ad source to retrieve the ads for display to the user – see include, but are not limited to, figures 4-5, col. 8, lines 30-64, col. 15, lines 35-65, col. 17, lines 25-32).

Regarding claim 6, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the schedule information includes a time schedule for displaying the promotions (e.g. triggering event indicating an appropriate time to display the selected advertisement – see include, but are not limited to, col. 8, lines 39-64, col. 15, lines 35-65).

Regarding claim 7, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the schedule information includes specified promotions for displaying the promotions (e.g., based on ad parameters, or ad selection rules – see include, but are not limited to, col. 11, line 31-col. 12, line 32).

Schlack also discloses schedule information includes specified promotions for displaying the promotions (e.g. based on ad information – see include, but are not limited to, col. 6, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 9, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses a bulk manager server that retrieves the promotions from a database (see include, but are not limited to, col. 8, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 10, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 9. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are stored in a cache (see include, but are not limited to, figure 5, col. 15, lines 12-34, col. 18, lines 7-14).

Regarding claim 11, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 9. Zigmond further discloses the scheduler instructs the bulk manager server to retrieve the promotions from the database and send the promotions to designated network devices (the ad source retrieves appropriate advertisements and send to network devices at the household for display in response to trigger event, ad selection criteria sent by the video programming content provider – see include, but are not limited, figures 3-5, col. 8, lines 30-64, col. 11, line 30-col. 12, line 67).

Regarding claim 12, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are displayed at a designated time (see include, but are not limited to, col. 8, lines 39-54, col. 15, lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 13, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are displayed when the viewers watch designated shows (col. 12, lines 44-60).

Regarding claim 14, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the membership criteria are based on demographic of the viewers who use the network device (see include, but are not limited to, col. 10, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 15, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the membership criteria are based on geographic locations of the viewers who use the network device (col. 10, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 16, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the membership criteria are based on channel and promotion history data (col. 10, line 48-col. 11, line 30).

Regarding claim 17, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The limitation "the scheduler schedules the promotions for delivery to specific promotion groups" is either read on Zigmond (see col. 14, lines 34-58) or read on Schlack (see col. 6, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 18, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 17. The limitation "the promotion groups are collections of network devices" is either read on Zigmond (e.g., network devices at different households (col.

10, lines 24-63; col. 14, lines 35-58) or is read on Schlack (see include, but are not limited to, col. 6, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 19, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 18. Zigmond further discloses the promotion groups are based on matching the membership criteria to the viewership profile (e.g., men, women, certain age groups, etc. – see col. 14, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 20, the limitations of the method as claimed correspond to the limitations of the system as claimed in claim 1, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claims 21 and 23, the limitations of the method as claimed correspond to the limitations of the system as claimed in claim 3, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claims 24-25, the limitations of the method as claimed correspond to the limitations of the system as claimed in claim 9, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 9.

Regarding claims 22, 26-28, 30, 32, the limitations of the method as claimed correspond to the limitations of the system as claimed in claims 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19.

Regarding claim 29, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 28. Zigmond further discloses the program includes a trigger in the broadcast (see include, but is not limited to, col. 4, lines 36-52).

Regarding claim 31, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 20. Zigmond further discloses the promotions such as advertisements are retrieved using phone line, or cable modem, or Internet, or World Wide Web connection, etc. (see include, but are not limited to, col. 10, lines 5-15). Thus, the promotions are inherently retrieved across a unicast medium.

Regarding claim 33, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotion agent subsystem at the individual network device collects data as to which the one or more promotions of the transmission schedule were actually watched by a viewer associated with the individual network device, and uploads the data collected to provide information relating to the success of the one or more promotions (see include, but are not limited to, col. 4, lines 53-67, col. 9, lines 21-55, col. 11, lines 13-30, col. 17, lines 32-49).

Regarding claim 34, the additional limitations correspond to the additional limitations of claim 33, and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 33.

Regarding claims 36-37, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are displayed covering a viewable screen, displayed covering a portion of the viewable screen (e.g. cross-over link overlays on conventional television display – col. 19, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 38, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotion include promotional content presented in a multimedia format selected from a group consisting of audio, video, graphics, icons, Internet hyperlink, and combinations thereof (see include, but are not limited to, col. 9, lines 8-20, col. 18, lines 29-62).

Regarding claim 39, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are displayed in a format selected from a group consisting of a banner, a hot spot, and a full motion streams (e.g. cross over link, or full motion of pay per view, advertisement, etc. see include, but are not limited to, col. 9, lines 8-20, col. 18, lines 29-62, col. 19, lines 1-22).

Regarding claim 40, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are presented in a form

Art Unit: 2623

selected from a group consisting of an electronic program guide, a channel information bar, and an overlay for video broadcasting (see include, but are not limited to, col. 11, lines 1-12, col. 19, lines 1-32).

Regarding claim 41, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are simultaneously active within a video device, each of the promotions being independently selectable (see include, but are not limited to, col. 16, line 65-col. 17, line 8).

Regarding claim 42, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 41. Zigmond further discloses each of the independently selectable promotions is presented in a different form selected from a group consisting of an electronic program guide, a channel information bar, and an overlay, and an overlay of video broadcasting programming (see include, but are not limited to, col. 11, lines 1-12, col. 16, line 65-col. 17, line 8, col. 19, lines 1-32).

Regarding claim 44, Zigmond in view of Schlack teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 20. Zigmond further discloses displaying selected promotions (see include, but are not limited to, col. 4, lines 45-52, col. 13, lines 40-52).

Regarding claims 45-50, the additional limitations as claimed correspond to the additional limitations as claimed in claims 36-38, 40-42, and are analyzed as discussed in the rejections of claims 36-38, 40-42.

5. Claims 35 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond et al. (US 6,698,020 B1) in view of Schlack (US 7,185,353) as applied to claim 1, or 20 above, and further in view of Alexander et al. (US 6,177,931).

Regarding claim 35, Zigmond in view of Schlack discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Zigmond further discloses the promotions are advertisements or any type of video programming, such as pay per view, special interest television service, or the like (col. 6, lines 13-29). Thus, the promotions are full motions streams presenting commercial information. Zigmond also discloses at the appropriate time indicated by the trigger event, the video programming feed is interrupted and the selected advertisement is displayed to the viewer using a display screen of the home entertainment system (col. 4, lines 40-52). However, Zigmond in view of Schlack does not explicitly disclose the full motion stream presenting commercial information and covering an entire screen area.

Alexander, in an analogous art, discloses the promotions are full motion streams presenting commercial information and covering an entire screen area (e.g., customized advertisements, customized program guide data comprises video clips of future

program, video advertisement, etc. are displayed in full screen – see include, but are not limited to, col. 24, lines 21-30, col. 14, line 64-67, col. 6, lines 65-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zigmond in view of Schlack with the teaching of displaying promotion cover entire screen in order to allow the viewer to view the promotion easier.

Regarding claim 43, the additional limitations as claimed correspond to the additional limitations as claimed in claim 35, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 35.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Thomas et al. (US 2002/0023270 A1) discloses three part architecture for digital television data broadcasting.

Bird (US 2002/0082941 A1) discloses method and system for the dynamic delivery, presentation, organization, storage, and retrieval of content and third party advertising information via a network.

Shoff et al. (US 6,240,555 B1) discloses interactive entertainment system for presenting supplemental interactive content together with continuous video programs.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-7295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Son P. Huynh

October 1, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'anh' followed by a stylized flourish.